

Date: Mon, 30 May 94 04:30:09 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #227
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest

Mon, 30 May 94

Volume 94 : Issue 227

Today's Topics:

Code test speeds (2 msgs)
CW is fun!

How do I get started? (2 msgs)

Merge the CW test with the Theory Test (6 msgs)

What *does* the FCC think? (was Re: Code test speeds)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sun, 29 May 1994 01:14:08 GMT

From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpad

Subject: Code test speeds

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2rdgg7\$3i2@chnews.intel.com> cmoore@ilx018.intel.com (Cecil A. Moore -FT~) writes:

>

>Hope you didn't misunderstand my whining, Michael. I have an advanced
>ticket and could probably pass a 20 wpm multiple-choice code test.

That multiple choice code test should be thrown out. I would love to see the one-minute error-free code test brought back.

>I am whining about an arbitrary, obsolete, elitist, holier-than-thou
>Morse code requirement that is irrelevant to the great majority of
>ham radio modes. It is simply tradition and dogma and it's time for
>the karma to run over the dogma.

I wish you folks would spend more time on the bands rather than on the newsgroups! From my own observations I see that 50% or more of the HF communications are done in CW. Therefore the code is certainly not obsolete, nor arbitrary, nor elitist, nor irrelevant.

73 Cec,
Jeff NH6IL

Date: Sun, 29 May 1994 01:06:42 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <9405181552.AA16790@GRSEQ1.gr.oracle.com> jcaradim@gr.oracle.com writes:
>
> The only world-wide accepted
>abbreviations are those included in the Q-code.
>
>ITU regulations saying that we are not allowed to use encrypted (in any way) tr
>ansmissions?
>
>.... sending CQ

John: I couldn't resist pointing out an error in your article. You say that the Q-code is the only recognized world-wide standard for abbreviations. If that's true then the prosigns CQ, DE, XXX, TTT, SOS, SK (which should actually be written as VA [see any commercial telegrapher's manual]), AR, K, BK (commercial/military use BT), plus about 100 more, are encryptions and therefore are prohibited.

Of the 100 or so more, TU, ETA, R, AA, AB, WA, WB, are also included.

As a U.S. Coast Guard CW operator I used these prosigns 100's of times daily; they were on our ITU list of standard OP SIGS.

Please use more care when you present facts in your arguments.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: Sat, 28 May 1994 20:26:59 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!news.cac.psu.edu!psuvm!
news.yzu.edu!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: CW is fun!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <052694143901Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) writes:

>mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:
>
>>And that's why a knowledge of horsemanship is required to get a HF'ania
>>drivers license.
>
>That's why it SHOULD have, not why we should keep it.
>

Dan, in spite of your inability to enjoy my attempt at lighthearted fun, you have finally noticed that there are two arguments that constantly get mixed up. Unlike the horse situation in this country, in HF'ania things are currently set up to allocate many privileges to "horses", and thus the horse-drivers license analogy does not apply TODAY. Of course, we can change the regulations, limiting our CW horses to beaches and trails, and then the analogy will indeed hold.

Thanks also to Richard McAllister for pointing out one major oversight in my description of HF'ania. Digimobiles are also allowed on "horse-only" roads (but not on auto roads). I knew that! It must have been the exotic locale that made me forget. And you score full credit for your Quality Riding Patrol! BTW, Richard, is your "Bzzzt" of electromechanical origin, or is it a packet cluster? Just wondering...

As someone who uses many modes, and who has made a living off computers since the S-100 days, I have no doubt that the CW requirement will be leaving us soon. Then we will have lots of high-tech, expensive black boxes doing our communicating for us, which maybe one percent of us will understand. Tell me again how this serves the purposes of amateur radio? I know it serves the purposes of AT&T, and of the military, but thier goals are not our goals.

Mike, KK6GM

Date: 28 May 1994 22:16:47 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!
news.duke.edu!eff!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!cmoore@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: How do I get started?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Michele Inglis (minglis@fox.nstn.ns.ca) wrote:
: HEY! I'm looking for some information on how to start my own high school
: radio station. Any advice would be greatly appreciated. Charles.

All the Frequently Asked Questions about ham radio are available by anonymous FTP from oak.oakland.edu under \pub\hamradio.

73, KG7BK, CecilMoore@delphi.com

Date: Sun, 29 May 1994 19:11:00 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!modem110.ucdavis.edu!
ddtodd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: How do I get started?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2s7fiv\$gqk@owl.nstn.ns.ca> minglis@fox.nstn.ns.ca (Michele Inglis) writes:

>From: minglis@fox.nstn.ns.ca (Michele Inglis)
>Subject: How do I get started?
>Date: 28 May 1994 10:05:35 -0300

>HEY! I'm looking for some information on how to start my own high school
>radio station. Any advice would be greatly appreciated. I've been reading
>this newsgroup for a while now but I still feel unfamiliar with the terms and
>equipment you use. Once again I'd love some info. on how to go about setting
>up my own radio station (for high school).

Do you mean a two way amateur radio station or a music station? If it is the
latter try rec.radio.non-comm (I'm not sure if it's noncomm or non-comm). If
you are talking about Amateur radio try a local radio store and ask for
licensing info. then talk to some local club members so you'll at least get
an idea of what amateur radio is capable of doing. Then, when you start
getting serious and know what you want start asking specific questions that
aren't answered to you satisfaction in your books etc. either here or
rec.radio.amateur.misc as appropriate.

cheers es good luck,

Dan

Dan Todd ddtodd@ucdavis.edu kc6uud@ke6lw.#nocal.ca.us.na
Charter Member: Dummies for UNIX

When radios are outlawed, only outlaws will have radios
- David R. Tucker on rec.radio.amateur.policy

Date: 28 May 1994 22:13:20 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!

cmoore@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Merge the CW test with the Theory Test
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

sohl,william h (whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com) wrote:

: Well, it's been several days now and no one seems to want
: to comment on the suggestion that, except for the 5wpm
: exam, that the 13wpm and 20wpm 10 question CW tests simply
: be merged for scoring with the theory tests for general and
: advanced.
: Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)

Bill, I'll vote for that. Newsline says that most hams are in favor of lowering the CW requirement for General down to 10wpm and a lot think it should be lowered to 5wpm. There is a large group of old "tech+'s" who had to pass the General written and 5wpm CW who would be Grandfathered into the General class under those conditions.

I'm not anti-code... I use it and enjoy it. But it seems that most hams agree that it gets more emphasis than it deserves. What I don't understand is why the ARRL is strangely silent on this issue. I don't recall the League being for or against the status quo. Has there been a recent recommendation from the ARRL?

73, KG7BK, CecilMoore@delphi.com

Date: Sat, 28 May 1994 23:45:59 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Merge the CW test with the Theory Test
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

cmoore@ilx018.intel.com (Cecil A. Moore -FT-~) writes:

> Bill, I'll vote for that. Newsline says that most hams are in favor
> of lowering the CW requirement for General down to 10wpm and a lot
> think it should be lowered to 5wpm.

Considering the sources Newsline used to conduct their "poll", it doesn't surprise me that they got the results that they did. Its the same as if Bill Clinton took a poll at a nursing home to see if people thought universal health care is a good idea.

Had Newsline conducted a poll of HF operators, I bet their results would have been remarkably different.

As it is, its nothing more than a biased poll, which for purposes of representing the opinions of all amateurs is completely useless.

MD

--
-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Sun, 29 May 1994 19:04:43 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!modem110.ucdavis.edu!
ddtodd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Merge the CW test with the Theory Test
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994May28.234559.17328@cs.brown.edu> md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:
>cmoore@ilx018.intel.com (Cecil A. Moore -FT-~) writes:

>> Bill, I'll vote for that. Newsline says that most hams are in favor
>> of lowering the CW requirement for General down to 10wpm and a lot
>> think it should be lowered to 5wpm.

>Considering the sources Newsline used to conduct their "poll", it
>doesn't surprise me that they got the results that they did. Its the
>same as if Bill Clinton took a poll at a nursing home to see if
>people thought universal health care is a good idea.

Mike since you seem to know all about the poll could you please enlighten the rest of us. since I don't listen to or read Newsline I don't know who they credited with conducting the poll. Cecil just said "Newsline says" but you seem to have intimate knowledge of the poll. Was it commissioned by Newsline of a true polling organization? Did they randomly sample the Amateur population and do the poll themselves? Did they call all the repeater operators who carry Newsline and ask them?

Dan

=====

Dan Todd ddtodd@ucdavis.edu kc6uud@ke6lw.#nocal.ca.us.na
Charter Member: Dummies for UNIX

When radios are outlawed, only outlaws will have radios
- David R. Tucker on rec.radio.amateur.policy

=====

Date: Sun, 29 May 1994 18:49:52 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Merge the CW test with the Theory Test
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

ddtodd@ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:

> Mike since you seem to know all about the poll could you please enlighten the
> rest of us. since I don't listen to or read Newsline I don't know who they
> credited with conducting the poll. Cecil just said "Newsline says" but you
> seem to have intimate knowledge of the poll. Was it commissioned by newline of
> a true polling organization? Did they randomly sample the Amateur population
> and do the poll themselves? Did they call all the repeater operators who carry
> Newsline and ask them?

I only know as much as anyone else who read the Newsline posting. That posting indicated that support for reducing the code requirement seemed to be strong, with many people claiming that the 10wpm reduction still wasn't enough, that in fact the general license should be reduced to a 5wpm requirement.

As a basis for this "consensus", Newsline indicated that it had drawn this conclusion from hams on packet and other online services, such as America Online.

One does not need to have "intimate knowledge of the poll" to know that it is a biased poll. Sampling those two mediums mentioned is not a random sample, and in no way represents the entire population of hams. Clearly any sample taken from those mediums would be biased, since both those mediums are populated heavily by no-code techs who have a vested interest in seeing the code requirements reduced. Hence, it's only natural to see the results skewed towards the "reduction" end of the curve.

If you'd like a better understanding, I recommend that you refer to a statistics textbook which discusses hypothesis testing, random sampling, how to conduct a survey, statistical error and bias. I'm sure the discussion of these topics here would get quite dull to those reading.

MD

--
-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Mon, 30 May 1994 01:18:33 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!caen!crl.dec.com!crl.dec.com!nntp1.kg.dec.com!
nntp2.cxo.dec.com!iamu.chi.dec.com!little@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Merge the CW test with the Theory Test
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994May29.184952.3724@cs.brown.edu>, md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

|>
|>I only know as much as anyone else who read the Newsline posting. That
|>posting indicated that support for reducing the code requirement seemed
|>to be strong, with many people claiming that the 10wpm reduction still
|>wasn't enough, that in fact the general license should be reduced to a
|>5wpm requirement.
|>
|>As a basis for this "consensus", Newsline indicated that it had drawn
|>this conclusion from hams on packet and other online services, such as
|>America Online.
|>
|>One does not need to have "intimate knowledge of the poll" to know that
|>it is a biased poll. Sampling those two mediums mentioned is not
|>a random sample, and in no way represents the entire population of hams.

Do you have any solid facts that would prove your hypothesis that the sampled population is not representative of the entire population? Or is your conclusion simply conjecture based upon the outcome and that it isn't in agreement with your views? Come on, how can someone who claims to have taught a statistics course turn around and make a statement like: "know it is a biased poll."?

|>Clearly any sample taken from those mediums would be biased,
|>since both those mediums are populated heavily by no-code techs who have
|>a vested interest in seeing the code requirements reduced. Hence, its
|>only natural to see the results skewed towards the "reduction" end of
|>the curve.

Do you have any statistically significant evidence that supports your claim?

|>If you'd like a better understanding, I recommend that you refer to a
|>statistics textbook which discusses hypothesis testing, random sampling,
|>how to conduct a survey, statistical error and bias. I'm sure the
|>discussion of these topics here would get quite dull to those reading.

Take your own advice. For someone who "taught" statistics, I'm amazed that you'd suggest a 99% confidence interval. Most polls of this sort use a 95%

confidence interval as that is sufficient given the nature of the study. Also as I recall from statistics (taken some 20+ years ago), you need an approximation of the distribution to determine the sample size necessary to establish a given confidence interval. But I'm sure you know all this.

Oh yeah, one other thing. If your conjecture about the distribution of hams on packet and on-line services is correct, that in itself is evidence of the need to inject some change in the make up of the amateur population.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Mon, 30 May 1994 03:46:56 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Merge the CW test with the Theory Test
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@iamu.chi.dec.com (Todd Little) writes:

> Do you have any solid facts that would prove your hypothesis that the
> sampled population is _not_ representative of the entire population?

Oh goodie. Now I have to disprove "facts" which haven't been proven as
"facts" at all.

Do you have any evidence to show that the statistical techniques used
by Newsline to reach their published conclusion are, in fact, correct,
and address the questions which I have presented questioning those
methods?

> Or
> is your conclusion simply conjecture based upon the outcome and that it
> isn't in agreement with your views? Come on, how can someone who claims
> to have taught a statistics course turn around and make a statement like:
> "know it is a biased poll."?

There is a significant portion of the ham population which is not
involved in packet radio or online services. This "survey" did not
attempt to take into account the opinions of all amateurs, with equal
likelihood of being chosen to give their opinion. The "survey" was not
given on a random sample of the ham population. Hence, it is an
invalid survey, for the purposes of claiming what the amateur community
as a whole wants.

And sorry, that's not conjecture, those are facts.

> Do you have any statistically significant evidence that supports your claim?

I'm not the one making the claim. I'm questioning the statistical methods used to arrive at the broad generalizations made.

> Take your own advice. For someone who "taught" statistics, I'm amazed that > you'd suggest a 99% confidence interval. Most polls of this sort use a 95% > confidence interval as that is sufficient given the nature of the study.

So you have any statistically significant evidence that supports your claim that "most polls of this sort use a 95% c.i."?

The level of statistical error that you or I are willing to accept is going to be different. There is no "right" or "wrong" statistical error level.

> Also

> as I recall from statistics (taken some 20+ years ago), you need an > approximation of the distribution to determine the sample size necessary to > establish a given confidence interval. But I'm sure you know all this.

Ideally, yes, you should know some characteristics about the distribution in order to determine what type of hypothesis test and sample size to use. However, with a population of over 600,000, I'm sure you recognize that the sample size would have to be larger than that which one could obtain by reading a few messages on packet or AOL, to obtain statistical significance even at the .05 error level.

> Oh yeah, one other thing. If your conjecture about the distribution of hams > on packet and on-line services is correct, that in itself is evidence of the > need to inject some change in the make up of the amateur population.

Why? Are you going to start forcing people to like packet radio or online services? I thought you were against forcing people to like cw? Why would you want to inflict something similar? Or, is it a case of "what's good for the goose...?"?

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Mon, 30 May 1994 05:38:10 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
Subject: What *does* the FCC think? (was Re: Code test speeds)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2rgane\$elb@chnews.intel.com> cmoore@ilx018.intel.com (Cecil A. Moore -FT--) writes:

> It is just that the amateur radio tests are
>divided into (telegraphy) VS (everything else in the world).
>Telegraphy is just not that important compared to everything else.

On HF it seems to be - at least 50% of the QSOs are in code.

>I can see the day coming when the FCC takes away some of our frequencies
>_BECAUSE_ we are wasting them on an old obsolete mode of communications
>like a bunch of ten-year-old boy scouts.

Oh Cec, just because voice is becoming obsolete I can't see the FCC taking away 2M. Although your observation is correct: everyone with their 2M walkie-talkies do look like boy scouts.

Jeff NH6IL

P.S. I'm still over 100 articles behind the rest of you - difficult to catch up when I keep having to correcting all the misinformation you folks put out...

Date: Mon, 30 May 1994 05:27:49 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <SR0.94May17235139@media-lab.media.mit.edu>,
<RFM.94May18134613@urth.eng.sun.com>, <1994May19.103347.2562@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: What *does* the FCC think? (was Re: Code test speeds)

In article <1994May19.103347.2562@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>
>The wording of this is significant to FCC watchers. Normally when
>the FCC is expressing policy, the FCC uses phrases such as "the
>Commission believes" or "staff asserts". Here they're saying "
>the amateur community...desires to preserve". That indicates to
>me that they are trying to divorce themselves from the position
>expressed by the amateur community.

Rather, they're probably tired of receiving mail from folks protesting the code test. Their wording can be interpreted as ``Look, quit pestering us about the code - a majority of your peers want the code so stop bothering us.''

>This is key, they now see amateur radio as trouble.

Your key doesn't fit the lock...

You're the only person who can add 2 + 2 and have it come out to equal 5.
Don't mix fact and opinion unless you use an 'IMHO'.

Jeff NH6IL

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #227
